

SUMMARY

The practice-as-research projected 'RUN FOR YOUR LIFE' is a sixty minute autobiographical solo performance. The performance took place on a scale map painted on a black floor, marking all of the world's countries and their capitals. The solo performer runs from one to the next in alphabetical order while telling stories of leaving her home. She continues to tell stories and give statistics from her native land, and her new chosen home. Redrawing the parts of the world most important to her, she gives us a glimpse of how her national and personal identity may be formed and impact on her life. She maps out some of the places she would like to visit, see and explore, before ending with a statement of planning one or more of these possible journeys.

The critical commentary or reflection discusses three different areas or themes employed in the performance 'RUN FOR YOUR LIFE', departures, maps and autobiography. It will look at the role of the travelling artist in society. What they can offer to the people they meet and the places they travel through. It will also discuss how this performance was brought further with a trip to Barcelona. The performer stated that she would take this trip at the end of the performance.

In the section on maps, the choice and construction of the map used in the performance will be discussed. It will also explore the different types of maps that were employed, maps that go beyond what conventional cartography can express or represent.

The final section on autobiography considers how the phrase at the end of the performance (stating that the performer will leave on a given date) is viewed by the audience. Is it deemed to be a promise or simply an utterance by a performer on stage?

RUN FOR YOUR LIFE

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY

BY

SINÉAD CORMACK

INTRODUCTION

This is a critical commentary on the solo performance “RUN FOR YOUR LIFE”, which will be referred to as RFYL throughout, performed by myself, Sinéad Cormack. This commentary will be split into three sections for discussion.

The first section will deal with the links between departures and performance in RFYL, the choices made in relation to the performance format. It will also look at how different artists engage in what Noyes terms reciprocal tourism (Noyes 1997). The section will end with a look beyond the performance, to my journey to Barcelona and further to as yet untaken trips, and how these may be viewed with regard to RFYL and my position as an artist.

The second section will look at maps. It will discuss the choices taken in the decision to use the Mercator projection, with analyses of how this projection constructs maps, and the advantages of it, in comparison to other projections. It will also look at the conceptual ideas in relation to political world maps, what they include and omit. I will then discuss different types of conceptual maps, such as the ‘deep map’, in relation to Mike Pearson’s ‘Bubbling Tom’ (2000) and RFYL. I will also explore the comparison between these deep maps and Deirdre Heddon’s autotopography (Heddon 2008), and the idea of maps as palimpsest (Nelson 2001).

The last section will explore the final utterance of the performance RFYL in relation to J.L. Austin’s ‘performative utterance’, and how this can be viewed in the context of an autobiographical performance (Austin 1975). It will consider Schechner’s

'believed-in theatre' in relation to this context (Schechner 1997). I will also discuss the audience's role and views on this utterance and their possible impressions of it.

DEPARTURES

"I showed my appreciation of my native land in the usual Irish way, by getting out of it as soon as I possibly could."

George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)

Richard Schechner called a proto-performance, "a source or impulse that gives rise to a performance; a starting point." (Schechner 2002: 191). This, as Schechner stated can be more than one thing, and often is. Anything can give rise to a performance such as a script, an article, or an image. One of the proto-performances or proto-p's for RFYL was the desire to physically move my body to other parts of this planet, my desire to travel.

This has been the inspiration for many performers and artists. Verena Tay discussed how staying in one place has been her norm, in her article 'What is snow like?' (Tay 2002). She ponders and admires the "people who globetrot constantly-migrate/live overseas for long periods. Why do they get to travel, and not I?" (Tay 2002: 144). I empathise with this, despite my living in a country foreign to my own for four years. I maintain a longing to see the world.

The circumstances of the performance RFYL would not allow for extensive travel, followed by a period of reflection and the devising of a performance. Therefore it was

decided that the performance would be studio based with the focus on this desire, rather than on the actual activity of carrying out the desire. I would have to travel internally.

The performance of RFYL, charts my history of travel through to the still imagined journeys I would like to take. The locations and reasons for wanting to take these journeys are varied, from wanting to visit friends in Canada and the United States of America, to travelling to Cape Verde simply because I have almost no knowledge of it and did not previously know of its existence.

There are many ways in which people travel, by foot, bike, car, bus, train, boat and plane. There are also different reasons for travelling, some travel for pleasure and rest, while others travel for pilgrimage or adventure. The travelling artist often questions these methods and reasons. What can they give as they travel? Dorothy Noyes uses the term 'reciprocal tourism' (Noyes 1997: 57) to describe the exchange between those who travel and those who host. It is more than a simple exchange of money (although it may be a part of it); it is an exchange of cultures and ideas, the making links to other places. As the term reciprocal suggests the exchange must be mutual, both parties must give something in exchange for something else. This puts the traveller in the position of offering something more than fiscal currency. These offerings often come in the form of art.

As Noyes explains "reciprocal tourism is a more effective means of cultivating social networks than either the Internet or more conventional tourism. It constructs a particular kind of relationship", (Noyes 1997: 57). This is a relationship of understanding,

or common experience. The physical body is needed for this construction, as without it the exchange would not be possible. If we think abstractly for a moment, RFYL may be viewed as reciprocal tourism. The performer is travelling the world inside a studio space, shared by the audience. The performer may be seen as offering her body in performance as a gift to the spectators, similar to how she may in the real world outside of the studio.

‘Lone Twin’ is a duo that can be seen as an example of artists who engage in a type of reciprocal tourism. Their performance ‘Nine Years’ (2006) charts their journey around the world. While on this journey “[A]s a gift they offered theatrical presentations to the people they met on their travels.” (Lone Twin website). Throughout their nine years of travel they performed seven hundred times. Many of these performances took place in the street with an invited or accidental audience, and often both. These performances were often and mostly based on the people they met and the places they encountered on their travels, specific to the locality in which they were being performed.

As I did not make any journeys as part of the process of devising RFYL, I am left to ponder these ideas for the future. RFYL ended with the phrase ‘I will leave’. This can be viewed as a promise of future action (which I will explore fully in the section on autobiography). Due to the phrases nature as a promise, I felt that I ought to undertake it; I was obliged by its utterance in front of an audience. I may never encounter some of the people who comprised the audience, and they may never know if I did leave or not, but despite this I felt compelled to do so.

On the 22nd of January 2010 I flew to Barcelona, Spain. I travelled alone, as a single female on her 24th birthday. Reactions to the notion of my travelling alone varied to extremes. Some warned me of potential dangers, almost to the point of instilling fear, while others congratulated me on my 'courage' and wished me luck and a happy experience. Some of the former reactions echo Deirdre Heddon's view on Terry O'Connor's actions during the devising of Forced Entertainment's 'The Travels' (Heddon 2008: 114). Upon seeing 'The Travels' Heddon described how she was surprised by O'Connor's actions when researching and travelling to the locations for the performance. She viewed these actions as dangerous. O'Connor travelled down 'Rape Lane' alone, despite it being very quiet and deserted. She also stayed overnight in an area she was repeatedly told to stay away from as it was not safe, when travelling to see 'Time Park'. These are actions that should not be carried out by women, or so we are told. The female sex is culturally viewed as weak and vulnerable, and therefore it is not safe for women to be alone in the outside space.

Similar to O'Connor, while in Barcelona, I acted 'dangerously'. Not only did I travel to the city alone, I also travelled around it alone, both during the day and at night. I drank and went clubbing with strangers I had met in the hostel I was staying in, I got lost walking up a mountain as the evening crept closer, I asked unknown men for directions and allowed them to walk me almost to the door of my destination. I also walked down side roads alone in the dark and got lost more than once wandering in the city at night. Despite acting in such a manner, I did not feel completely safe and relaxed all of the time. There were occasions when I was aware of my own female body alone in space, and was reminded of how people told me Barcelona can be a dangerous city for

a lone female, especially at night. On reflection I ponder why I *did* act dangerously despite feeling anxious. I, like O'Connor was refusing to act like prey and see strangers and particularly men as predators. I was claiming my space as a female outside in an unknown city. It was a conscious act of denying fear. RFYL was claiming my right to physically travel around this world, my actions in Barcelona were acting out that right.

Despite my best intentions I did not engage in any immediate acts of reciprocal tourism while in Barcelona. I was for all intensive purposes a cultural tourist. I took tours on sight-seeing buses, ate and drank in bars and restaurants, attended a ballet, and a flamenco performance, and went clubbing. I did keep a diary of my stay. This is to become a diary of my travels from there into the future. There is a possibility that this will lead to further works and performances.

With this in mind and as RFYL was an autobiographical performance I wonder how it will continue. Is there a next step and if so what it is? Alexander Del Re wrote about how art and life had become intertwined for him, how "life was not going to be separated from art anymore" (Del Re 2001: 88). When I embark on my travels, can they by association to the performance RFYL, be seen as art? What separates the two? If they are seen as art or an extension of it, do they have to fulfil an artistic purpose? Must I log all my travels in my diary as potential material in hypothetical future projects? These are questions I cannot answer at present. All I can be certain of is that I wish to continue travelling and challenge the restrictions that were not present in RFYL, such as money, security and being a woman. I also want to continue making art, whether the travel and art mix and how remains to be seen.

MAPS

“Home is not where you live but where they understand you.”

Christian Morgenstern (1871-1914)

*“The beauty of maps, and the reason they aesthetically approach, even surpass,
many intentional works of art, is their unintentional subjectivity.”*

(Lucy Lippard 1997:82 and Rosenbaum 2001: 54)

“Maps flatten the world to better lay out territories on a table or tack them to a wall” (Schechner 2002: 40). The scenography of RFYL was dominated by the large world map, painted in white on a black floor. Measuring 16.5m by 10.34m, it covered the entire performance space, with the audience raised on a stepped platform below the line of the Antarctic. From this position the audience were able to look down at the map, while maintaining a horizontal view of the performer, performing on it.

The map used in RFYL, was the Mercator projection of the political world map. Schechner tells us this projection “distorts the globe wildly in favour of the northern hemisphere” (Schechner 2002: 41). This is often considered to be a colonial view, given that, Mercator designed this projection “to suit the scenarios of the mariners, merchants, and military of the expansionist, colonizing Western Europe” (Schechner 2002: 42).

Map projections are made by the transformation of spatial point coordinates; they transform one configuration for another. This is done according to mathematical rules. The numbers of possible projections are infinite. As Denis Wood explains in his book ‘The Power of Maps’ (1992), as the Mercator projection is, “centred on the equator, the

pole can't be shown at all; it's turned into a line of 'infinite' length, so that closer you get to the pole the greater the areal distortion." This results in the area of land in the northern hemisphere being greatly increased, while that of the southern hemisphere is reduced, giving a distorted proportion of land area between the two.

An alternative to this is the Lambert Azimuthal Equal-area projection, which is area accurate. It achieves this by centring on the North Pole, with the pole as a point. This results in a distortion of shape, which becomes more prominent as you move further away from the pole point.

Both of these projections have their advantages and disadvantages. The Lambert Azimuthal Equal-area projection is essential for the mapping of distributions, such as, population, crops, and religion. While the Mercator projection distorts the areal relationships, it preserves shapes, it is 'conformal'. This means that "the scale changes equally in all directions so that any small portion of the map has its correct shape" (Wood 1992: 57). It is also widely used for charts, as it is the only projection in which the lines of constant compass bearings, or loxodrones, are straight. There is no projection that can have the advantages of both the Mercator and Lambert Azimuthal Equal-area projections. Areal conformity and equal area are mutually exclusive.

Due to its employment in charts and navigation, the Mercator projection was chosen for RFYL, keeping with the theme of travel. Its areal conformity also meant that undue attention would not be given to the map at the expense of the rest of the performance. As we are more accustomed to conformal maps, it was felt that there may

be a risk of diverting attention if an equal-area projection were used. While the map was a large part of the performance, I did not want all of the attention to be focus solely on it.

The map employed in RFYL was not a simple Mercator projection. It was also a political map, with the continental land masses divided up into the countries of the world. The political map is a conceptual stretch. “National boundaries are not sensible” (Wood 1992: 8), we cannot see them on the landscape in the same way we can see mountains, rivers and lakes. These boundaries are also often disputed, with neighbouring countries disagreeing. It is because of this that the map “does not *map locations* so much as *create ownership at a location*” (Wood 1992: 21). It was with an awareness of the many and varied disputes with relation to national borders, that the map used in RFYL was chosen. It was decided on the basis of borders that are most widely and globally accepted, which may or may not be in line with my own political views. This resulted in many groups or areas, who are attempting to gain independence, being omitted, such as Tibet, while others such as Kosovo, who recently gained its independence were included. The distinction between those countries or parts of the world that were considered sovereign and independent, from those who were not, was made by the makings of the capital cites as orange X’s on the map in RFYL. Only those with a capital city marked where included in the soundtrack and running. Non-sovereign entities such as Greenland, which is part of the Kingdom of Denmark, were not included.

Heike Roms follows Wood’s argument that maps construct the world, and may be seen as “performative utterances”, that they “constitute a speech act of persuasion” (Roms 2006: 12/13). That is to say that the map says that “‘this *is* here’ and ‘that is *not*

here” (Roms 2006: 13), and by saying this, they seem to make it true, at least in the minds and imaginations of those who view the map.

Maps achieve this subjectivity in many ways. Maps have authors. It is a myth cherished among cartographers that maps have a, “dispassionate neutrality” (Wood 1992: 22). These authors embody their prejudices and bias, their curiosity and elegance, imagination and attention into their labour. All of this impacts on the maps they produce.

Roms’ continues, suggesting that this may solicit responses. These responses may come in many forms, from re-drawing of the map to different types of conceptual maps. This may draw attention to what conventional cartography does not map. Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks lament the loss of participation with land, “[W]hat is lost here is not land but the lived experience of land” (Pearson and Shanks 1997: 43). They move to call for what “William Least Heat-Moon has called deep maps” (Pearson and Shanks 1997: 51). These deep maps will allow for the inclusion of interpretations and juxtapositions of the poetic, political, contemporary and historical.

Pearson and Shanks go further to suggest that story telling and solo performance may be some of the ways in which this can be achieved. Pearson’s own performance, ‘Bubbling Tom’ (2000) (Heddon 2008: 97) is an example of this. In 2000, Mike Pearson returned to his childhood village of Hibaldstow and gave a guided tour of ten sights that had childhood significance. This performance was presented to a small number of spectators, the majority of whom were from the village and some of whom were

relations of Pearson's. By travelling from one site to the next in the village, Pearson was able to mix location or place with memories, smells and ways of telling.

The performance of RFYL may also be seen as a type of deep map. Although not taking place on a site, in the site-specific sense of the term, RFYL took place on a representation of a much larger site, that of the globe. As it addressed travelling on a global scale, a world map replaced what might traditionally be used as the location of deep map performances. The performer physically moving around on the map, while telling autobiographical stories of her travels and leaving home, against a background of the soundtrack of a list of the world countries, adds depth to the map. This depth is increased and widened as the performance continues with statistics relating to the performer's two homes (childhood and chosen university home), the re-drawing of Ireland and Wales, imagined future journeys and the soundtrack of capital cities. These personal and political elements juxtapose each other to give a greater understanding or view of the world and the performer as a person in it.

This, as well as Pearson's 'Bubbling Tom', may be seen as what Deirdre Heddon calls "autotopography" (Heddon 2008: 90). This is "writing place through self (and simultaneously writing self through place)" (Heddon 2008: 91). Similar to autobiography, it is an act of seeing creatively. This can be viewed as a type of mapping that allows the writing of the unknown or unrecognised, comparable to deep maps.

Maps can also be seen as "palimpsest", as a "parchment or the like from which writing has been partially erased to make room for another text" (Nelson 2001: 20). This means that what are produced as a result of erasure, for the addition of more text, are

layers of writing. The re-drawing of Ireland and Wales in RFYL can be viewed as an example of this in performance. The original Ireland and Wales, while erased or ‘rubbed out’, were still faintly visible, while their enlarged versions were drawn around and over them.

Richard Gough marvelled at the “medieval cartographer who attempted to chart what was known and dared to imagine and propose what was unknown and undiscovered: a process of creating new knowledge through illustration and illumination via a wonderful mix of fact and fiction” (Gough 2001: 1). There is a certain element of this in the naming of potential journeys in RFYL. As these journeys are still only potential the performer cannot possibly know what she will discover if she takes them, she can only imagine. These imaginings are based on stories, myths, hearsays, some researched knowledge and occasional fictions. As with the medieval cartographers it is not the detail of these imaginings that raises interest but the ability to imagine, what is unknown.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

“Take care to get what you like or you will be forced to like what you get.”

George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)

In this section I want to focus on the end of the performance RFYL, specifically the phrase or statement made,

“on the 22nd of January 2010, I will leave.” (Appendix III).

I will narrow this down to the words, “I will leave”. Do these words fulfil the criteria for Austin’s ‘performative utterance’ or ‘performative’, as discussed in his book, ‘How To Do Things With Words’, (Austin 1975)? The word, performative, “derives from ‘perform’ the usual verb with the noun ‘action’: it indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action - it is not normally thought of as just saying something” (Austin 1975: 6/7). This means that by using a performative, we do not only say something, but we do something. Common examples of this are ‘I do’ (during a wedding ceremony), ‘I bet’ and ‘I promise’.

Let us look at what the conditions are that need to be fulfilled in order for a phrase to be a performative:

“A. they do not ‘describe’ or ‘report’ or constate anything at all, are not ‘true or false’; and B. the uttering of the sentence is, or is a part of, the doing of an action, which again would not ‘normally’ be described as, or as ‘just’, saying something.” (Austin 1975: 5)

“I will leave” conforms to the first condition, A, as it is not true or false, and it is not describing my leaving or my action or saying ‘I will leave’. It’s conformity to B is a little bit more complicated. As it is not an explicit performative (which I will explain in more detail later) the action being performed is not immediately obvious. ‘I will leave’ may be seen as a version of ‘I promise I will leave’. If we take this to be the case, the phrase then acts as a performative in much the same way as ‘I shall be there’ can be used instead of ‘I promise I shall be there’.

These words must also be uttered in circumstances that are in some way ‘appropriate’, and commonly the speaker or other person will have to perform other

utterances or actions. The circumstances in which 'I will leave' was uttered are that of an autobiographical performance. Austin stated that "a performative utterance will, for example, be *in a peculiar way* hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage, or if introduced in a poem, or spoken in soliloquy" (Austin 1975: 22). I would argue that this does not allow for the innovations in theatre that occurred after Austin formulated these ideas. Autobiographical performance became more and more popular with second wave feminism in the 1970's, whereas Austin lectured on these notions in his 1955 William James Lectures, delivered at Harvard University, on which his book 'How To Do Things With Words' is based (Austin 1975). With autobiographical performance more and more artists moved away from playing fictional characters and started to tell stories of their own lives and experiences. The line between art and life was becoming blurred.

These autobiographical performances, specifically from performance art and performance studies origins may be seen as part of what Schechner described as 'believed-in theatre' (Schechner 1997). These differ from believed-in performance¹, as they are presented as art or theatre. However this is theatre that is not make-believe, it is somehow real. It contains real people doing real things, such as Mike Pearson giving a tour of the village he grew up in, Hibaldstow, in 'Bubbling Tom' (Heddon 2008: 96), or Tim Miller's performance 'Glory Box', in which he tells the story of his homosexual relationship with an Australian, who may be deported, as their relationship is not recognised by existing legislation (Heddon 2008: 45 and Miller website). A lot of performance art is an example of believed-in theatre, such as Franko B bleeding (Franko B website). It is not an effect or a trick, it is his real blood. Similarly with Ron

¹ Believed-in performance refers to the playing social and or personal identities, such as mothers, teachers, priests in everyday life. The people are who they perform. They are real people really acting out their real lives .

Athey (Schechner 1997: 86/87) or Stelarc (Stelarc website), these are performers doing real things to their bodies in front of an audience. A lot of performance art, extreme or not is an example of believed-in theatre.

I want to examine RFYL as believed-in theatre. I would consider it to be a piece of performance art, as opposed to a conventional theatre piece. Myself as performer, was not playing a character, I was playing myself. The stories and text used were not fictional; they were stories from my own life. It was autobiographical, not fictional. The data such as the lists of countries and capital cities were researched and depending on your political viewpoint, were as accurate as they could be, as were the statistics of population, area and language. The desire to travel and the places listed were mine. As Schechner said, "In *believed-in theatre*, real life has invaded theatre" (Schechner 1997: 98).

If we are then to take RFYL as a piece of believed-in theatre, based on the argument above, what of the phrase 'I will leave'? It has not been said by a fictitious character but by a real person. Although the performance was a performance of the self, and not the self in everyday life I argue that it fulfils the criteria for a performative. The circumstances were not conventional to performatives, in Austin's views on performatives in theatre, but one could still say that they are appropriate. 'I will leave' was uttered by a single person to an audience as a promise of future action, and in the context of the autobiographical may be taken as the same as it would be in everyday life.

Casting doubt on this is the sincerity in which the utterance was made. If not made seriously and in full sincerity, the performative will be in 'bad faith' (Austin 1975: 11). In the case of a promise, as with, 'I will leave', the person who utters it must at the time of uttering believe that they will leave, and that it is feasible to, not merely that they will try. This follows that they have the intention of carrying out the promise. In RFYL I was sincere in my utterance. Despite the fantasy of limitless and un-prohibited travel imagined in RFYL, I had every intention of leaving on the 22nd of January 2010. The method of leaving and the destination were deliberately omitted from the text spoken, in order to make the act of leaving more feasible in various situations. This does not take away from the performative utterance itself, but reduces the possibility of it being void or in 'bad faith'.

As I stated above, 'I will leave' is not an explicit performative. This may lead an audience to be unsure as to whether it is a performative. Is it or is it not a promise? We may call this a "primitive as distinct from explicit" (Austin 1975: 33) performative, as there may be nothing in the circumstances to say whether it is or not. However Austin does leave space for this in his theory. He states that "we may get the performative without the operative words" (Austin 1975: 59). In place of 'I promise' we may commonly have 'I shall' or as in the case of RFYL, 'I will'. This means that the performative may be understood without uttering the exact words 'I promise' but only the uttering of 'I will'.

This leads me to conclude that 'I will leave', uttered at the end of RFYL fulfils the criteria for a performative, in theory. I am then left to consider the audience. Will they have taken the utterance of 'I will leave' to be sincere and truthful, or 'happy', or will they simply view it as another utterance by a performer, not to be considered as any different

to that uttered by an actor playing a fictional character? The journeys described are unprohibited by the practicalities of life, and may seem unlikely or impossibly in reality. However these are not the journeys which the performer promises to take, they are hypothetical journeys she imagines taking. The promise is only to leave, with the destination, journey length, and mode of transport unspecified. I concede that this may cause some confusion, as to whether the promise is real.

The composition of the audience, largely consisting of persons with a knowledge or interest in performance studies and performance art may help to sway this in the favour of believing the utterance to be true. The context in which the performance took place, that of an educational institution may add to this. Due to this context much of the audience were known to the performer. I am then left to consider how this mutual knowledge may impact on their viewing of the performance. As colleagues they may already have knowledge of some of the stories being told, which may increase their reading of the performance as autobiographical. Considering this the audience may expect the action of leaving to be carried out, despite the fantastical nature of the travel imagined. The element of fantasy is a theatrical devise of telling, rather than a blueprint for travel.

If the performance was presented for an audience of strangers with little knowledge of performance studies and performance art, would they view the utterance in the same way? It could be argued that they would see it in a similar way as to an utterance made by a fictional character. Despite the autobiographical nature they may not view it to be true.

On the 22nd of January 2010, the promise and the performative was fulfilled, I did leave.

CONCLUSION

RFYL is a performance that emerged from my own personal wish to travel. Not to be restricted by money, distance, access, security or being a woman, to make the difficult possible. These restrictions were not included in the performance. It was a performance of desire, of unimpeded globetrotting, a fantasy of travel. However restrictions do exist and this kind of voyage is not possible.

This real future was realised in Barcelona, where I travelled alone. I faced and challenged some of these restrictions, such as that of being a woman in the outdoor space. However despite my intentions I did not engage in any acts of reciprocal tourism, of offering something more than money to the people I met and place I travelled to.

The map in RFYL is a map of the past and of the future. It is a map of the world as we know it, of position and locations. The performer has histories in some of these locations, of living in them and leaving them. She is in some ways formed by the world she lives in. The Mercator projection was chosen for its links to navigation. It is a map for explorers.

In RFYL that map went further than being a map of the world. It went deeper. The performer and the map were connected. Stories of past adventures were shared,

and layered with facts. Placed on top of this were imagined future journeys, comprising of a mix of the factual, hearsays and desires.

RFYL looks forward to the future. It ends with a declaration of a date to commence this travel, a promise to leave. This moves the performance from the present, beyond the studio and into the world. It is no longer to be just a dream, what was imagined in the studio is to be realised. This realisation will not be as simple, it will be challenging.

RFYL is an autobiographical performance that brings the past into the present and looks beyond it, and dares to dream of a future. It is a fantasy that asks the performer to act again, to make it real.

Bibliography

Austin, J.L., (1975) How To Do Things With Words, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Del Re, Alexander, (2001) '*Departing the Nation: Illusion as Art*', in Performance Research Volume 6(1) 'Departures', London: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Ltd, pp. 87-89.

Forced Entertainment, <http://www.forcedentertainment.com/?lid=481>, (accessed 17 February 2010).

Franco B, http://www.franco-b.com/gallery/g_performance.htm, (accessed 24 February 2010).

Gough, Richard, (2001) '*Editorial: On Maps and Mapping*', in Performance Research Volume 6(2) 'On Maps and Mapping', London: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Ltd, pp. 1-3.

Heddon, Deirdre, (2008) Autobiography and performance, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lippard, Lucy, (1997) The Lure of the Local, New York: The New Press.

Lone Twin, <http://www.lonetwin.com/duo-work.htm>, (accessed 17 February 2010).

Lothar Schröder, Johannes, (2001) '*The Currency of the Travelling Artist*', in Performance Research Volume 6(1) 'Departures', London: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Ltd, pp.8-11.

Miller, Tim, <http://www.timmillerperformer.com/video.html>, (accessed 17 February 2010).

Nelson, Robin, (2001) '*Set Map Slip = Palimpsest (working title)*', in Performance Research Volume 6(2) 'On Maps and Mapping', London: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Ltd, pp. 20-29.

Noyes, Dorothy, (1997) '*Reciprocal Tourism and the Fear of the Floating Local: Networkers and Integrates in a Catalan Provincial Town*', in Performance Research Volume 2(2) 'On Tourism', London: Routledge, pp. 54-63.

Pearson, Mike and Shanks, Michael, (1997) '*Performing a Visit: Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*', in Performance Research Volume 2(2) 'On Tourism', London: Routledge, pp. 41-53.

Roms, Heike, (2006) '*Eye and Ear, Foot and Mouth: Mapping performance in three journeys and one withdrawal*', in Richard Gough, Judie Christie and Daniel Watt eds. A Performance Cosmology: Testimony from the Future, Evidence of the Past Oxon and New York: Routledge, pp. 10–14.

Rosenbaum, Sarah, (2001) '*The Map: Shifts, Overwrites, Overlays*', in Performance Research Volume 6(2) 'On Maps and Mapping', London: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Ltd, pp.54-59.

Schechner, Richard, (1997) '*Believed-in Theatre*', in Performance Research Volume 2(2) 'On Maps and Mapping', London: Routledge, pp.76-91.

Schechner, Richard, (2002) Performance Studies: An Introduction, New York: Routledge.

Schechner, Richard, (2006) Performance Studies: An Introduction Second edition. New York: Routledge.

Stelarc, <http://www.stelarc.va.com.au/photos/index.html>, (accessed 24 February 2010).

Tay, Verena, (2002) '*What Is Snow Like?*', in Geddy Aniksdal, Maggie Gale, Julia Varley, eds The Open Page Theatre/Women/Travel (7), Holstebro, Denmark: Odin Teatrets Forlag, pp. 144-145.

Wood, Denis with Fels, John, (1992) The Power of Maps, New York: Guilford Press.

Appendix I

Countries

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Afghanistan | Belgium | Cape Verde |
| Albania | Belize | Central African Republic |
| Algeria | Benin | Chad |
| Andorra | Bhutan | Chile |
| Angola | Bolivia | China |
| Antigua and Barbuda | Bosnia-Herzegovina | Colombia |
| Argentina | Botswana | Comoros |
| Armenia | Brazil | Congo |
| Australia | Brunei | Democratic Republic of the Congo |
| Austria | Bulgaria | Costa Rica |
| Azerbaijan | Burkina | Cote d'Ivoire |
| The Bahamas | Burundi | Croatia |
| Bahrain | Cambodia | Cuba |
| Bangladesh | Cameroon | Cyprus |
| Barbados | Canada | Czech Republic |
| Belarus | | |

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------|------------|
| Denmark | Georgia | Ireland |
| Djibouti | Germany | Israel |
| Dominica | Ghana | Italy |
| Dominican Republic | Greece | Jamaica |
| East Timor | Grenada | Japan |
| Ecuador | Guatemala | Jordan |
| Egypt | Guinea | Kazakhstan |
| El Salvador | Guinea-Bissau | Kenya |
| Equatorial Guinea | Guyana | Kiribati |
| Eritrea | Haiti | Kosovo |
| Estonia | Honduras | Kuwait |
| Ethiopia | Hungary | Kyrgyzstan |
| Fiji | Iceland | Laos |
| Finland | India | Latvia |
| France | Indonesia | Lebanon |
| Gabon | Iran | Lesotho |
| The Gambia | Iraq | Liberia |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Libya | Moldova | Oman |
| Liechtenstein | Monaco | Pakistan |
| Lithuania | Mongolia | Palau |
| Luxembourg | Montenegro | Panama |
| Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | Morocco | Papua New Guinea |
| Madagascar | Mozambique | Paraguay |
| Malawi | Myanmar | Peru |
| Malaysia | Namibia | Philippines |
| Maldives | Nauru | Poland |
| Mali | Nepal | Portugal |
| Malta | Netherlands | Qatar |
| Marshall Islands | New Zealand | Romania |
| Mauritania | Nicaragua | Russian Federation |
| Mauritius | Niger | Rwanda |
| Mexico | Nigeria | Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| Federated States of Micronesia | North Korea | Saint Lucia |
| | Norway | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Samoa | Sudan | Uganda |
| San Marino | Suriname | Ukraine |
| São Tomé and Príncipe | Swaziland | United Arab Emirates |
| Saudi Arabia | Sweden | United Kingdom |
| Senegal | Switzerland | United States of America |
| Serbia | Syria | Uruguay |
| Seychelles | Taiwan | Uzbekistan |
| Sierra Leone | Tajikistan | Vanuatu |
| Singapore | Tanzania | Vatican City |
| Slovakia | Thailand | Venezuela |
| Slovenia | Togo | Vietnam |
| Solomon Islands | Tonga | Yemen |
| Somalia | Trinidad and Tobago | Zambia |
| Republic of South Africa | Tunisia | Zimbabwe |
| South Korea | Turkey | |
| Spain | Turkmenistan | |
| Sri Lanka | Tuvalu | |

Capitals

| | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Kabul | Brussels | Bangui |
| Tirana | Belmopan | Ndjamena |
| Algiers | Porto-Novo | Santiago |
| Andorra la Vella | Thimphu | Beijing |
| Luanda | La Paz | Bogotá |
| St John's | Sarajevo | Moroni |
| Buenos Aires | Gaborone | Brazzaville |
| Yerevan | Brasília | Kinshasa |
| Canberra | Bandar Seri Begawan | San José |
| Vienna | Sofia | Yamoussoukro |
| Baku | Ouagadougou | Zagreb |
| Nassau | Bujumbura | Havana |
| Manama | Phnom Penh | Nicosia |
| Dhaka | Yaoundé | Prague |
| Bridgetown | Ottawa | Copenhagen |
| Minsk | Praia | Djibouti |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|
| Roseau | Accra | Rome |
| Santo Domingo | Athens | Kingston |
| Dili | St George's | Toyko |
| Quito | Guatemala City | Amman |
| Cairo | Conakry | Astana |
| San Salvador | Bissau | Nairobi |
| Malabo | Georgetown | Bairiki |
| Asmara | Port-au-Prince | Prishtina |
| Tallinn | Tegucigalpa | Kuwait |
| Addis Ababa | Budapest | Bishkek |
| Suva | Reykjavik | Vientiane |
| Helsinki | New Delhi | Riga |
| Paris | Jakarta | Beirut |
| Libreville | Tehrān | Maseru |
| Banjul | Baghdād | Monrovia |
| T'bilisi | Dublin | Tripoli |
| Berlin | Jerusalem | Vaduz |

| | | |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|
| Vilnius | Podgorica | Panama City |
| Luxembourg | Rabat | Port Moresby |
| Skopje | Maputo | Asuncion |
| Antananarivo | Rangoon | Lima |
| Lilongwe | Windhoek | Manila |
| Kuala Lumpur | Yaren | Warsaw |
| Male | Kathmandu | Lisbon |
| Bamako | Amsterdam | Doha |
| Valletta | Wellington | Bucharest |
| Delap-Uliga-Djarrit | Managua | Moscow |
| Nouakchott | Niamey | Kigali |
| Port Louis | Abuja | Basseterre |
| Mexico City | P'yongyang | Castries |
| Palikir | Oslo | Kingstown |
| Chisinău | Muscat | Apia |
| Monaco-Ville | Islamabad | San Marino |
| Ulan Bator | Melekeok | São Tomé |

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Riyadh | Paramaribo | Vaiaku |
| Dakar | Mbabane | Kampala |
| Belgrade | Stockholm | Kiev |
| Victoria | Bern | Abu Dhabi |
| Freetown | Damascus | London |
| Singapore | T'aipei | Washington, D.C. |
| Bratislava | Dushanbe | Montevideo |
| Ljubljana | Dodoma | Toshkent |
| Honiara | Bangkok | Port Vila |
| Mogadishu | Lomé | Vatican City |
| Cape Town | Nuku'alofa | Caracas |
| Seoul | Port of Spain | Ha Noi |
| Madrid | Tunis | San'ā' |
| Sri Jayewardenepura | Ankara | Lusaka |
| Kotte | Asgabat | Harare |
| Khartoum | | |

Appendix II

Photographs from rehearsals of the performance 'RUN FOR YOUR LIFE'.

All photographs taken by Chris Okerberg.









Appendix III

Extract from performance text.

This is an imaginary journey, on a flat map, painted on a black floor. I want to try make it real.

So I made a decision yesterday, on the 22nd of January 2010, I'm going to leave. I'm going to leave wherever it is, and go somewhere. Get on a plane, a boat, a bike or simply on my feet, and leave.

I don't know where I'm going to go yet. Perhaps to Toronto to visit Shannon, to Boston to visit Cara and Chris, or perhaps somewhere I've never been or I don't know, Sri Lanka, Brazil, I don't know.

But I do know on the 22nd of January 2010 I will leave, on my 24th birthday.

I don't know when I'll be back.

All I know is that on the 22nd of January 2010, I will leave.